

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-6236

DANIEL A. MAJETTE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

RONALD J. ANGELONE, Director, Virginia
Department of Corrections,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Richmond. James R. Spencer, District
Judge. (CA-02-494)

Submitted: May 29, 2003

Decided: June 4, 2003

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Daniel A. Majette, Appellant Pro Se. Eugene Paul Murphy, OFFICE OF
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Daniel Majette, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000). An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue for claims addressed by a district court on the merits absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). As to claims a district court dismisses solely on procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability will not issue unless the petitioner can demonstrate both "(1) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right' and (2) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling.'" Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 684 (4th Cir.) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)), cert. denied, 534 U.S. 941 (2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Majette has not satisfied either standard. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 123 S. Ct. 1029 (2003). Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions

are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid in the decisional process.

DISMISSED